Hoover's non-autopys, AP stories a214,a219, both saying that the coroner held that with death "due to natural causes, an autopsy was not indicated." If he had said not required, that would have been closer. But indicated it was. It was avoided because despite his repeated lies on the subject, Hoover knew he suffered "hypertensive cardiovascular disease". his it say that despite his assurances to the contrary, he knew he could kick off at any unannounced minute, as he did. Now I have had two experiencesof this sort in the past 10 days, in my own family, where each of two (I am without knowledge of a third) deaths of close relatives was, without doubt, from natural causes. In these two cases, there could have been a variety of natural causes. But there was no doubt at all, with both deceased long hospitalized, that causes were natural. With my stepfather, there was an autopsy. He was 88. Aside from one of the two thingsthat could have killed him, discovered in the autopsy, bile blockage and the separation of an earlier intestinate patch when 18" were removed (leading to peritonitis, known to exist before autopsy), he had hardening of the arteries and other problems of serious and potentially fatal character. With my brother-in-law, who is to be buried without an autopsy tomorrow, my sister-in-law got piled off at the doctors' evasiveness in saying why they wanted an autopsy and had been because she could never find a doctor who had made any kind of real examination of the patient, and she would not sign for an autopsy. Her husband, a three-fifthsdaily alcoholic before permanent reform years ago, he had had a series of strokes and heart attacks over the past two years, negan with emphysema, had had brain damage after one of the strokes, and, as with my step father, science had the possibility of learning from an autopsy. So, to say one on Hoover was not 'indicated is to lie, and the lie is political. HW

Ret to the